



Claiming Profession: The Dynamic Struggle for Teacher Professionalism in the Twentieth Century

Diana D'Amico¹
George Mason University

In October of 2009, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan spoke to a crowd of teacher educators and future teachers gathered at Teachers College, Columbia University. Duncan used his speech, "Teacher Preparation: Reforming the Uncertain Profession," to call for "revolutionary change." "To keep America competitive," he warned, "we need to recruit, train, learn from and honor a new generation of talented teachers."² For Duncan and others across the nation, the pathway to "most effective teachers" – the lynchpin in our "Race to the Top" – turns on recruiting a new type of individual.

(Continued on Page 3)

¹ Diana D'Amico (Ph.D., New York University) is Assistant Professor at George Mason University. Her research focuses on examines the development of policy questions surrounding teacher quality and professionalism over the twentieth century from three key vantage points: teacher education programs, teacher unions, and school administration. Her dissertation, "Claiming Profession: The Dynamic Struggle for Teacher Professionalism in the Twentieth Century" (chaired by Jonathan Zimmerman), was the Politics of Education Association's Outstanding Dissertation Award winner for 2011-2012.

² Arne Duncan, "Teacher Preparation: Reforming the Uncertain Profession," (presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 2009).

District-Level Employment Non-Discrimination Policies for Gay and Lesbian Teachers in Northwest Ohio

Christopher J. Frey³
Bowling Green State University

This case study investigates employment non-discrimination (END) policies related to sexual orientation in ninety school districts in Northwest Ohio, USA. Ohio is one of 34 states where employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is legal. While state employees in Ohio are protected, and 17 Ohio municipalities have laws banning employment discrimination based on sexual orientation, public school teachers are not covered by these provisions. To assess the presence of district-level employment protections, collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) and school board policies in 90 districts in the northwestern corner of Ohio were collected and analyzed for terminologies and language inclusive of sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression. While the larger study looked at employment rights, leave policy, definitions of family, domestic partner benefits, and bullying policies, only findings related to the distribution of END policies are examined here.

(Continued on Page 7)

³ Christopher J. Frey (Ph.D., Indiana University-Bloomington) is Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator of the Master of Arts in Cross-cultural and International Education at Bowling Green State University. His research focuses on comparative histories of indigenous schooling, minority, immigrant and colonial education.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Page 1	<i>Claiming Profession: The Dynamic Struggle for Teacher Professionalism in the Twentieth Century</i> Diana D'Amico George Mason University
Page 1	<i>District-Level Employment Non-Discrimination Policies for Gay and Lesbian Teachers in Northwest Ohio</i> Christopher J. Frey Bowling Green State University
Page 2	Message from the President
Page 6	PEA Outstanding Dissertation Award: Call for Nominations
Page 7	2013 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop: A Call for Participants
Page 13	Treasurer's Report

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

BONNIE FUSARELLI
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Dear PEA Members,

Thank you for being a member of the Politics of Education SIG and helping advance the effort to study and understand the politics of education in the United States and beyond.

As the 2012-13 academic year gets into full swing, we are pleased to be publishing the Fall issue of *PEA Bulletin*. Once again, Kyle Ingle (Bowling Green State University) and Ann Allen (The Ohio State University) have put together an interesting issue featuring the work of politics of education scholars.

In this issue, Diana D'Amico contributes an intriguing piece that examines the development of policy questions surrounding teacher quality and professionalism over the twentieth century from three key vantage points: teacher education

programs, teacher unions, and school administration. Her dissertation, "Claiming Profession: The Dynamic Struggle for Teacher Professionalism in the Twentieth Century" (chaired by Jonathan Zimmerman), was the Politics of Education Association's Outstanding Dissertation Award winner for 2011-2012.

You will also not want to miss the report by Christopher Frey on a study that is analyzing collective bargaining agreements in school districts in Ohio, specifically looking at provisions for gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees.

I hope that you will take a few minutes to scroll through the committee pages on the PEA website where you will see the names and photos of the volunteers who carry out PEA's work (politicsofeducationassociation.wikispaces.com). We are deeply grateful for their work and dedication and I hope you will express your thanks when you see them at UCEA and AERA. Reports from committee chairs describing PEA's various programs can be found throughout the issue.

Of special note, I am pleased to report that PEA received twice as many submissions for AERA than the previous year. I would like to convey a special thanks to Tamara Young (North Carolina State University), who serves as Program Chair and the volunteer program reviewers who assisted her. PEA will have 3 paper/symposia sessions and 6 roundtable/poster presentations at AERA.

Please join us for breakfast and participate in the next PEA business meeting that will be held at the UCEA Convention in Denver on [Friday, Nov 16 - 7:00am - 7:50am](#). We will be in the Denver City Marriott, Denver 2 Room. We have tentatively lined up a very special guest speaker for the session, but the speaker's availability is dependent on the work schedule of the U.S. Senate in mid-November! I hope you won't mind if I keep you guessing until we receive final confirmation! In any event, this session will be a wonderful opportunity to reconnect over breakfast and plan for the future!

See you in Denver,

Bonnie Fusarelli



Claiming Profession...

(D'Amico, continued from page 1)

Though he noted in another essay that “teaching... should be one of the nation’s most revered professions,” in his assessment, it simply was not.⁴ Teachers must “rise to a higher standard of professionalism,” he recently argued.⁵ Real educational change, contemporary reformers argue, is contingent on cultivating a new “highly qualified teacher.”

Duncan is not alone in these calls. In fact, he is in good historical company, joining an ever widening chorus of twentieth century educators who called for better, more professional teachers. In 1919, a member of New York City’s Board of Education explained to a local newspaper reporter that, “the truth of the matter is that the service is not attracting the teachers we need, both from the standpoint of number and mental caliber.”⁶ In the midst of the Great Depression, faculty at Teachers College articulated similar trepidations as they advocated for increased attention to “weeding out poor material” in light of the low “intellectual capacity” of too many current teachers.⁷ With the close of the Second World War, a new generation of faculty members characterized the teaching population as “ne’er do wells, men and women who could not succeed in any other vocation.”⁸

For over a century, school administrators and teacher educators called for a “new generation of talented teachers.” But in the face of these criticisms over this same span of time teachers

⁴ Arne Duncan, "Elevating the Teaching Profession," *American Educator* (2009-2010): 3.

⁵ Arne Duncan, “Working Toward ‘Wow’: A Vision for a New Teaching Profession” (presented at the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, Washington D.C., 2011).

⁶ “Teaching is not Attractive,” 14 Feb 1919; Series 392; Box 3; Scrapbook 13; Municipal Archives, New York City Department of Records, New York City Board of Education Collection.

⁷ Committee on Teacher Education, *Report to the Dean and Faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University* (May 1936): 10; Gottesman Libraries, Teachers College, Columbia University.

⁸ Willard S. Elsbree. “Next Steps for the Teaching Profession.” *TC Record* (Jan 1946): 243-250.

claimed professional stature. For instance, describing how to deal with troublesome students in 1924, one teacher reminded “our work binds us to certain rules of honor and professional conduct.”⁹ In a radio speech delivered in 1940, a member of the Teachers Guild intoned “you look on us as professional people. Our training is as detailed and as expensive and as painstaking as the training of any doctor or dentist or lawyer or accountant.”¹⁰ Over two decades later, Charles Cogen, the first president of the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the New York City local of the American Federation of Teachers, spoke of teachers’ “high standards of professionalism.”¹¹ Extending these themes even further in 1970, Albert Shanker, the second UFT president, reasoned that teachers “like surgeons in an operating room... demand professional freedom.”¹²

Placed in the context of this extended framework, Duncan, the “Race to the Top,” and the entire notion of the “highly qualified teacher” represent the most recent chapter of a historic debate surrounding teacher professionalism. For over a century administrators, teacher educators and teachers within New York City and across the nation generated strikingly similar calls. However, each of these pleas occurred in and were thus the product of vastly different societies. From this vantage point the professional transforms from a static and quantifiable identity to an historical construct. Precisely what it means to be a professional – what such a person looks like and what rewards are at stake – shifts in tandem with larger social, political and economic transformations. Even more importantly, as today’s debates call into sharp focus, the professional is contested and negotiated, in the case of teachers, across the educational landscape. Socially

⁹ Elizabeth Macnamara. “Corrective Speech Work in Erasmus Hall High School.” *Bulletin of High Points in the Work of the High Schools of New York City* (Sept 1924): 12-23.

¹⁰ William Woolfson, Teachers Guild Sponsored Radio Speech, February 24, c. early 1940s; United Federation of Teachers (hereafter, UFT) Collection; Box 8; Folder 31; Tamiment Library/Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives (hereafter, Tamiment).

¹¹ Charles Cogen, Press Release, May 7, 1963; UFT Collection; Box 19; Folder 50; Tamiment.

¹² Albert Shanker, Speech Delivered at Syracuse University, 1971; UFT Collection; Box 91; Folder 45; Tamiment.

constructed identities embedded in the moniker are articulations of race, class and gender. The ways in which administrators, teacher educators and teachers, through their union, historically contested the terms of professional stature represent a fundamental struggle for power that transcends the schools.¹³

In “Claiming Profession”, the social and political meanings of professionalism are examined through a case study of New York City public school teachers throughout the twentieth century. Professional stature is sustained by a series of boundaries regulating who may come in and, even more importantly, who must stay out of the profession.¹⁴ Adhering to traditional definitions, scholars placed teachers outside the bounds of profession regarding them as a highly regulated, majority female group without possession of exclusive knowledge.¹⁵ This categorization,

¹³ For more on the history of teacher education, refer to David F. Labaree, *The Trouble With Ed Schools* (Yale University Press, 2006); James W. Fraser, *Preparing America's Teachers: a History*, Reflective History Series (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007). For more on teacher organizations refer to Marjorie Murphy, *Blackboard Unions: The Aft and the Nea, 1900-1980* (Cornell University Press, 1992); Wayne J. Urban, *Gender, Race, and the National Education Association: Professionalism and Its Limitations*, Studies in the History of Education (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2000). For the classic interpretation of the school bureaucracy, refer to David B Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1974). For more on "Claiming Profession's" historiographical contributions to these literatures, please refer to the dissertation.

¹⁴ Refer to Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Eliot Freidson, *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy, and Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Eliot Freidson, *Professionalism: The Third Logic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*, 1st ed. (New York: Norton, 1976); Steven G. Brint, *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994); Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).

¹⁵ Amitai Etzioni, *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization; Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers* (New York: Free Press, 1969); Dan C Lortie, *Schoolteacher; a Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); Richard Ingersoll and David Perda, “The Status of

however, does not change the simple fact that for over a century, teachers have claimed profession, and administrators and teacher educators have regulated and called for change through the same language. Drawing on Daniel Walkowitz's incisive study of social workers, “Claiming Profession” charts a new course, recasting the entire history of professionalism in three fundamental ways.¹⁶ First, while much of the literature allows for the political and social meanings of professionalism, there is little sensitivity to change over time. But as this history of teachers reveals, both what it meant to be a professional and how teachers attempted to achieve such a demarcation were inextricably linked to an idiosyncratic time and space. While teachers of the Progressive era defined their professional stature against the backdrop of immigration, claiming an expertise that correlated to nativity and whiteness, teachers of the Depression era, for instance, formulated their professional persona within the context of economic catastrophe. The resulting identity was fundamentally different. Asserting professional identity, the history of teachers suggests, is a process of definition. And teachers defined themselves most often against the children who filled the city's classrooms, with students representing a powerful foil for professionalism.

Second, in the literature traditional constructs of professionalism correlated to a white, middle class manhood. But rather than barring those who did not fit these characteristics, this sort of exclusivity beckoned people to it. As Jonathan Zimmerman wisely offered, “citizens did not merely accept or reject professional authority... Instead, like the experts, they tried to use new knowledge to advance their own agendas.”¹⁷ Disqualified by classic quantitative measures, teachers claimed the title seeking the prestige at its base. Over the twentieth century, women of various ethnicities comprised the

Teaching as a Profession,” in *Schools and Society: a Sociological Approach to Education* (Los Angeles: Pine Forge Press, 2008), 106–118.

¹⁶ Daniel J Walkowitz, *Working with Class Social Workers and the Politics of Middle-Class Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).

¹⁷ Jonathan Zimmerman, *Distilling Democracy: Alcohol Education in America's Public Schools, 1880-1925* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999) 2.

city's teaching population. Rather than redefining the meanings of profession, through their union teachers appealed to traditional constructions as a way to bolster their authority and stature in and out of the schools. Claiming profession enabled teachers to lay claim to the even more valuable and out of reach identities centered on idealizations of whiteness, the middle class, and manliness.¹⁸ The language of professionalism offered a powerful mechanism of social uplift.

Third, teachers were not alone as they crafted these identities. Instead, they did so alongside of administrators and teacher educators. Importantly, the professional persona was both created and contested. Though they spoke the same language of profession in response to the same shifting social, political and economic milieus, educators from across the city articulated competing constructions of the professional teacher. As JoAnne Brown offered, the language of profession enabled various groups to "draw upon established authority for their own purposes."¹⁹ As was the case in the city's schools, administrators, teacher educators and teachers often had very different, if not competing, purposes. The image of the professional teacher served different ends in the hands of different educators. Historically, teachers employed the language to sustain calls for higher pay and increased autonomy. Meanwhile, administrators and teacher educators often used it to highlight teachers' perceived deficiencies, bolstering their own calls for increased regulation or distilled curricula.

Surveying the shifting and contested images of the professional teacher across the twentieth century from 1900 to 1986, "Claiming Profession" is

¹⁸ For more on the intersection of work and identity refer to Ava Baron, *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); James R. Barrett and David Roediger, "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality and The "New Immigrant" Working Class," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16.3 (1997); David R. Roediger, *Working toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs* (New York: Basic Books, 2005).

¹⁹ JoAnne Brown, *The Definition of a Profession: The Authority of Metaphor in the History of Intelligence Testing, 1890-1930* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992), 18.

divided into four parts, each comprised of two chapters. Part I centers on the Progressive Era, part II on the Depression and War years, part III on the Postwar Era and part IV on the Rights Era. In important regards, this scholarship tells a story of change. Teachers understood themselves as professionals in profoundly different ways as they responded to the changing population of the schools and larger political shifts. Over the twentieth century, teacher educators and administrators, too, envisioned the professional teacher in disparate ways and, as such, called for different patterns of education and regulation. At the same time, however, the striking continuity we confront as today's educators iterate the same historic calls for more professional teachers cannot be ignored.

Propelled by a brain drain thesis, many policy makers and academics contend that with the various Rights Movements new opportunities opened for large segments of the population. According to the standard trope, lured by better pay and increased prestige, the so-called best turned away from teaching. But this thesis and all reforms that stem from it are fundamentally flawed in two essential regards. First, they ignore the larger history of calls for better teachers which extended far beyond the mid-1960s. And second, this thesis, the very engine propelling the search for "highly qualified teachers," ignores the history of the structures shaping teachers' work-lives. New opportunities did not simply draw talented individuals out of the schools. Instead, as this history reveals, the very people advocating reform today – administrators, teacher educators and union leaders – precipitated this labor market redistribution. The milieu of equal opportunity may have opened new doors, but factors pushing these individuals out of the schools were in motion long before.

The value of historical scholarship centers on its explanatory power. Beyond chronicling what happened, historical analysis can reveal *why*. I position my work to join a cadre of scholars who use history to cast fresh light on present policy issues. My current book project, *The Failure of Teacher Professionalization: A History*, offers a genealogy of professionalization reforms in public education from the first years of the common schools to the mid-1970s. Since the rise of the

common schools in the mid-1850s, policy makers called for “professional” teachers and linked the shortcomings of the nation’s schools to the caliber of the teaching population. Such critiques resulted in a bevy of reforms ranging from tenure, to increased education requirements, to the notion of the “highly qualified teacher.” Yet even as teachers entered classrooms with more qualifications, their authority and autonomy remained limited. Teacher professionalization, as it has manifested itself over the last century, has failed. The historic ideology of profession extended the pretense of stature and prestige to teachers but stemmed from disempowering gendered assumptions that impeded professional credibility. Rather than generating the authority and autonomy that delineates professionals, teacher professionalization policies strengthened the bureaucratic structure of the schools and conserved the goals of the institution. Professional credibility for teachers and the history of teacher professionalization reforms are antithetical.

**PEA OUTSTANDING
DISSERTATION AWARD:
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS**

**CAROL KARPINSKI
FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY**

This call is for the 2012-13 award for the best dissertation in the politics of education. It is designed to foster and support graduate student research and publication on political processes and outcomes in organized education grades preK-16, from the United States and abroad. One aim is to highlight and reward scholars studying political issues in education, as distinct from the interdisciplinary approaches taken by policy studies.

The PEA Dissertation Awards Committee welcomes any nominated dissertation that addresses the politics of education, including, but not limited to, those that focus on questions of democracy, voice, governance, inequality/equality, power, authority, political accountability, interest group interactions, coalitions and agency at any level of

analysis (federal/national, state/provincial, local). Acceptable methods include, but are not limited to, comparative political analysis, case-study analyses of broad trends and reform efforts, qualitative studies, political history and biography, primary and secondary data analysis.

The Award: A \$250 cash award, editorial and stylistic suggestions for publication from the PEA Awards Committee, and recognition at the annual business meeting of PEA held at the annual meeting of AERA. In addition, all finalists will receive a one-year honorary membership to the Politics of Education Association.

The Review Process: Completed nominations received by midnight December 1, 2012 will be reviewed by the PEA Dissertation Award Committee. Four to six finalists will be selected for further consideration by January 2013. Finalists and winners will be announced in the spring PEA Bulletin and honored at the annual PEA business meeting at the regularly scheduled AERA meeting in 2013.

Eligibility and Application Process: Dissertations from students who have successfully defended a dissertation for either an Ed. D. or a Ph.D. in political science or education between June 30, 2011, and July 1, 2012, are eligible for nomination.

The nomination process involves submitting a scholar application form including a four-six page (1,200 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which describes the topic and any conceptual underpinnings, details the methods of data collection and analysis, and briefly describes the findings and the conclusions. In addition a nomination form from the dissertation sponsor is required. The sponsor's nomination should describe why the dissertation is exemplary and assess its contribution to the politics of education. It also verifies that the doctoral degree was earned between June 30, 2011 and July 1, 2012. No incomplete nominations will be considered.

Completed applications and nomination forms are to be emailed by midnight December 1, 2012 to karpin@fdu.edu . Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt.

**2013 WILLIAM L. BOYD NATIONAL
EDUCATIONAL POLITICS WORKSHOP:**

A CALL FOR PARTICIPANTS

*KYLE INGLE
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY*

*TAMARA YOUNG
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY*

The Politics of Education Association and the University Council for Educational Administration are pleased to sponsor the annual Williams L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop. Held in conjunction with the annual meeting of AERA, the workshop is open to graduate students and recent doctoral graduates to give emerging scholars the opportunity to learn about current and promising research in the politics of education field, participate in break-out sessions related to their current career stage, and interact with leading politics of education scholars in their areas of interest. Break-out sessions include:

- Transitioning from graduate student to junior professor
- Managing the work/life balance
- Incorporating issues of social justice in research on educational politics
- Developing a research focus within the fields of educational politics and policy
- Teaching educational policy/politics of education
- Employment options beyond the professoriate

If you are interested in attending the 2013 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop in San Francisco as either an emerging scholar or mentor, please complete the appropriate online application form at the following websites:

[Emerging Scholars](#)

[Volunteer as a Mentor](#)

When/Where: The workshop will take place on April 17th, 2012 from 2:30-5:00 pm at a location convenient to the AERA conference hotels.

Eligibility: All students with an interest in educational politics and currently enrolled in graduate schools in the U.S. or abroad are welcome to attend as are educational researchers who earned their doctoral degrees after March 1, 2011. There is no fee to attend. However, space is limited. If you have any questions, please contact Kyle Ingle at wingle@bgsu.edu or Tamara Young at tamara_young@ncsu.edu



**Politics of Education
Annual Breakfast
UCEA Convention 2012**

Date: Friday, November 16th
Time: 7:00-8:00 am
Location: Denver City Marriott
Denver 2 Room.



District-Level Employment...

(Frey, continued from page 1)

After a brief literature review and discussion of methodology, descriptive analysis of the characteristics of the districts in Northwest Ohio with END policies follows with recommendations about the importance of extending employment protections for non-heterosexual educators.

It has been argued that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender (LGBT) public school teachers have historically been discriminated against more than any other group of professionals (National Education Association, 2012; Blount, 2005; Olson, 1987). Before the concept of homosexuality as an identity emerged in the American public consciousness the mid-20th century, suspicions about teachers' sexuality tended to focus on unmarried female educators "inspiring their female

students to remain single” and “making boys effeminate” (Blount, 2005, p. 67). After WWII, gays and lesbians were targeted because of their supposed susceptibility to Communism, which led to more federal employees being fired during McCarthy’s Red Scare because of suspected homosexuality than for suspected ties to Communism (Johnson, 2004). Employment discrimination against gay and lesbian teachers also intensified in the 1950s and 1960s. In Florida, the Johns Commission employed extralegal means to force teachers from their jobs and the profession (Fejes, 2008; Graves, 2009). The emergence of a national gay and lesbian rights movement also mobilized opposition, such as Anita Bryant’s campaign to repeal employment and housing protections in Dade County, Florida. Here too, teachers factored prominently in the debate over gay rights: Bryant’s campaign ran full-page advertisements in local newspapers with collages of graphic newspaper headlines about child pornography and sexual abuse, which were blamed on LGBT teachers (Fejes 2008). Bryant’s successful campaign inspired California State Senator John Briggs to initiate a referendum that, if it had passed, would have prohibited LGBT teachers who publicly acknowledge their sexual orientation from working in any California public school (Blount 2008). Briggs found support from former California State Superintendent Max Rafferty, who revealed during the campaign in *Phi Delta Kappan* that his work

in large part was to decide each month whether certain teachers were morally fit to be allowed to teach in California public schools. And from the beginning, I do assure you, we took for granted the self-evident proposition that a homosexual in a school job was as preposterously out of the question as a heroin mainliner working in the local drugstore. (Rafferty, 1977, p. 91)

These campaigns coalesced arguments against LGBT teachers that are still heard today: that they “recruit” young people, that they are more likely to sexually abuse children in their care, and that they will “confuse” children’s identity development (Jackson, 2007). Many oppose employing gay and lesbian teachers on religious grounds. In general,

opposition to LGBT teachers is greatest when the LGBT teachers are *honest* with their colleagues, and particularly their students, about their sexual orientation. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia’s dissent in *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003), which struck down the last of the state laws prohibiting homosexual acts, argued that “many Americans do not want persons who *openly* engage in homosexual conduct as... teachers in their children’s schools.” But since 2000, efforts to address discrimination based on sexual orientation in US schools have shifted away from employment protections, toward addressing the very important problems of bullying and suicides among LGBT youth. In the wake of this shift, an uneasy truce has emerged where, as Biegel (2008) suggests, LGBT teachers are generally accepted in schools, as long as they remain in the closet, or they act straight, what Kenji Yoshino (2007) calls *covering*. For employees, this creates a stressful environment where hiding a significant part of their private life is, or is perceived to be, necessary in order to remain employed. As I will argue later, it also sends mixed signals to students who are receiving messages that “it’s OK to be gay”, while LGBT teachers in their own schools can be fired simply for their non-heterosexuality.

Research on LGBT-friendly policies has focused on the cultural environment of the community and social movement theory to explain the diffusion of LGBT-friendly policies and representation. Nationally, Eckes and McCarthy (2008) suggest that litigation and policies concerning gay and lesbian teachers have expanded workplace protections, particularly in recent years around hostile working environments, but warn that there is no “perfect” policy to limit discrimination. Three studies analyzing the adoption of gay rights ordinances (Wald, Button, & Rienzo, 1996), gay and lesbian representation on school boards (Wald, Rienzo, & Button, 2002), and LGBT-inclusive sex education curriculum (Rienzo, Button, Sheu, & Li, 2006) used a similar model to analyze community and institutional characteristics common to LGBT inclusion. Briefly, these studies have used variations of a model that analyzes LGBT inclusion in relation to indicators of urbanism/social diversity (measured by school district size, college-educated population, and Blacks as a percentage of the county

population), political opportunity structure (measured by the Democratic vote in presidential elections and state LGBT rights law), resource mobilization (percentage of same-sex households, number of gay businesses, and number of “out” teachers), and communal protest (church membership and the percentage of Evangelical Christians). Overall, the results of these nationwide surveys are not surprising: LGBT-inclusive policies and representation are much more likely in diverse large cities that have substantial, politically active LGBT populations, statewide anti-discrimination policies, and where Evangelical Christianity is not dominant. Wald et al. (2002) and Rienzo et al. (2006) found in their nationwide survey of 400 school districts that 49% had non-discrimination policies for teachers, though their study relied on interviews, and did not include districts smaller than 300 students. Critically, they note that in relation to LGBT-inclusive health education, “state laws mandating protection of LGBT students predict the extent of district-level programs” (p. 96). Rather than randomly sampling districts, the present study looks at a region where there are few legal rights for LGBT people, including small school districts.

The Case: Northwest Ohio

The case for this study is 90 school districts in Northwest Ohio. School districts in 14 counties that make up the region were selected. Northwest Ohio is one of five cultural and economic regions of the state, and is more rural and conservative than other parts of Ohio. The region was chosen for its balance of urban, suburban and rural districts, its relatively diverse political, socio-economic and religious demographics, as well as convenience – the university where I teach is located in the center of the region. This also has allowed for repeated discussions over the last five years with teachers and administrators about the cultural and political environment for LGBT educators. The study was also limited to Northwest Ohio because surveying the 615 different school districts in Ohio was beyond scope of this small study.

About half of the region’s population of one million resides in the Toledo metropolitan area, with the remainder spread across a wide agricultural region of small cities and villages. Politically, the region is “purple”, garnering it considerable attention during presidential election years (Troy, 2012). The

economy is centered on agriculture and manufacturing, and has suffered a persistent decline in employment over the last decade. The region’s comparatively low population density resembles Appalachian Southeast Ohio more than the urban regions around Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Columbus. The rural areas and small cities of Northwest Ohio are overwhelmingly White with some pockets of Mexican-Americans, while Toledo is home to a considerable numbers of Blacks, Hispanics, and Middle Easterners. “Conventional and conservative”, the region has 12 of the 15 most religious counties in Ohio (Lubinger, 2004), and many counties in the western half of Northwest Ohio have very high rates of church attendance (Association of Religious Data Archives, 2012). In the absence of state END protections, only two cities in Northwest Ohio – Toledo (in 1997), and the college town of Bowling Green (in 2010) – currently have END protections for their residents (Equality Ohio, 2012b).

Ohio’s LGBT population has few legal rights or protections enjoyed by residents of other states. Ohio has no recognition of domestic relationships, no enumeration of LGBT protections in the state’s bullying law; the state bans dual-parent adoptions, has no employment or housing protections, nor does the state guarantee of the right to hospital visitation for same-sex partners (Gay Rights in the US). Two recent surveys have rated Ohio the worst in the Midwest, and among the worst nationwide for legal protections for LGBT people (Equality Ohio 2012a; eQualityGiving.org, 2012).

Methodology

Without explicit state laws banning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, LGBT teachers in Ohio must rely on the goodwill of administrators and school boards, and on district-level non-discrimination policies found in collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) and board policies. The CBAs analyzed in this study were accessed through the Ohio State Employment Relations Board, and were usually in effect for two to three years. Only contracts for teaching faculty were analyzed, not those for support or administrative staff. School board policies were found through online services, and by contacting districts whose policies were not publicly available. In the past ten

years, many school boards in the region have revised and standardized their policies, often contracting with companies like NEOLA to keep the districts up to date with state and federal policy changes. The majority of school boards in this sample used NEOLA or similar services, which has standardized the policy manuals across the region.

Data collected from the CBAs and board policies focused on enumerations and implicit or probable protections on the basis of sexual orientation (the sex to which one is attracted), gender expression (the socially-constructed and -interpreted gender characteristics that one outwardly expresses) and gender identity (one's private sense of her or his gender). When these protections were found, they were usually in non-discrimination policies, anti-bullying regulations, and definitions of family for the purposes of leave and benefits.

The author engaged a "methodology of the closet", which reflects the social and political environment around LGBT issues in places like Northwest Ohio where employment protections differ depending on locality and school district. By relying on publicly-accessible documents, and not directly inquiring about these policies with district officials, or interviewing administrators about their policies, the closet approach most closely resembles the way that prospective hires who are LGBT could learn about a district's policies without signaling their orientation to potentially hostile or unsupportive school officials. This illustrates one of the many tensions of being an LGBT teacher in a district and state without END policies: merely inquiring about the existence of these measures could risk one's job.

For the larger project, data collected from the CBAs and Board Policies were analyzed in relation to a wide variety of demographic data, including average household income for the district, the district's percentage of White teachers and students, the district's state ranking, the presence of LGBT organizations within the district, county-wide data on religious participation, same-sex couples, and ethno-racial diversity, as well as differences in Collective Bargaining organizations. However, because of the small number of districts with explicit END policies, statistical analysis of the findings is not meaningful. For this paper, findings

will be limited to discussing some important shared characteristics of the districts with END policies related to sexual orientation.

END Protections in Collective Bargaining Agreements

Of the 90 collective bargaining agreements analyzed for this study, four (4.44%) included sexual orientation in their non-discrimination statements; no CBA or board policy enumerated gender identity or gender expression. These four districts are Swanton, Perrysburg, Ottawa Hills, and Gibsonburg. All four districts are located inside the Toledo metropolitan area, and are all represented by the state branch of the National Education Association. All four districts fall into the Ohio Department of Education's (2007) typologies for low poverty and medium- to high-income districts. These four districts all had per capita incomes higher than the state average, with Perrysburg and Ottawa Hills among the wealthiest in the state. Politically, the suburban areas of Toledo tend to elect Republicans, but all four districts are located primarily in counties that voted in 2008 for Obama (who also won the state). The percentage of White students in the districts ranged from 83% to 87%, higher than the state average, but more diverse than many rural districts in the region. Racial diversity in these four districts generally comes from significant numbers of students of Hispanic or Asian descent; the percentage of African-American students in these districts ranges from less than 0.1% to 3.3%, significantly below the state average of 12%. These four districts stand out for their high incomes, their range of racial diversity among students, and their location within the Toledo metropolitan area.

END Protections in Board Policies

Of the 90 school districts analyzed, six (6.6 %) had END policies that unambiguously included sexual orientation. These districts are Toledo, Fremont, Bowling Green, Benton Carroll Salem, Patrick Henry, and Shawnee. A typical example of an inclusive END policy is from the Fremont City Schools Board Policy Manual:

The Board of Education does not discriminate nor tolerate harassment in its employment opportunities, educational programs or activities for any reason

including on the basis of race, color, religion, natural origin, sex, disability, military status, ancestry, sexual orientation, age or genetic information. (Fremont City Schools, § 3122)

Two other districts, Perrysburg and Liberty Center, had ambiguous board-enacted END policies that did not clearly extend to teachers. There are some shared characteristics among these six districts. First, they tend to be more racially diverse than the region as a whole. Toledo, Fremont, and Shawnee (near the city of Lima) have large populations of African-Americans and Hispanics, while more rural districts like Patrick Henry, Bowling Green, and Benton Carroll Salem have significant numbers of students who identify as Hispanic or multiracial. The percentage of White students in these districts ranged a high of 92% in Benton Carroll Salem, to 40.4% in Toledo, 58% in Fremont, and 80% in Bowling Green. Toledo and Fremont, the two largest districts, are characterized by the Ohio Department of Education (2007) as high poverty and high diversity while the remaining for rural districts have household incomes above the state average, and have comparatively low numbers of students in poverty. Four of the districts are located in counties that voted for Obama in 2008, though Patrick Henry and Shawnee are located in counties that voted overwhelmingly for McCain. Overall, the districts whose END protections are found in board policies exhibit similar characteristics, with either higher incomes and moderate diversity, or high poverty and high diversity.

Discussion

What accounts for the presence of END policies for gay and lesbian teachers in Northwest Ohio? These findings suggest that proximity to a major metropolitan area is a significant predictor of END policies. Of the 10 districts with END policies, only two were not inside the Toledo metropolitan area. Similarly, while earlier studies included measures of the Black population, the results of this study suggest that *any* ethnic diversity – particularly Hispanics and Asians – may contribute to more a more inclusive policy environment. One surprising outlying finding in this research was that 50 of the districts in the survey reported having no teachers of color on staff, and all but two districts had 95% or

more of White faculty. While there was some clustering of policies in districts with more teacher diversity, three districts with no teachers of color did have END policies. There was a clearer relationship between student (and thus, community) diversity and END policies: no district with more than 92% White students had END policies, and the ten districts with these policies generally were clustered together with other districts with diverse student populations. Political opportunity structure also appears to be a good indicator of LGBT-inclusive employment policies: eight of the ten districts are located in counties that voted for Obama in 2008. Other factors that might indicate opportunity for expanded END protections for gay and lesbian teachers will analyzed in detail in the larger study.

This study seems to confirm what many of us intuitively understand: that support and acceptance of gays and lesbians, particularly in roles as teachers where public opposition has been persistent, is more common in large, diverse, urban areas. These findings suggest that smaller, diverse cities and wealthy suburban and rural areas may also be supportive environments. In the past five years, anecdotal evidence from teachers and administrators in the region suggests that many of them have heard of teachers who they think might be gay, but there is little evidence of teachers being “out”. Many, particularly from rural districts, suggest that honesty about homosexuality would place an LGBT teacher in a difficult situation with the community, though few suggested that administrators would fire an “out” teacher. Many have also reacted negatively to suggestions that “out” teachers would contribute positively to the school environment: the most common refrain is that *no* teacher should say *anything* about their personal life. But it should also be apparent that heterosexual teachers, particularly in upper grades, casually refer to their spouses with no ramifications. How many heterosexual teachers would remain if they could never reveal their sexual orientation to their students?

Without clear policies, no gay or lesbian teacher can be certain that their sexual orientation will *not* impact their employment security. It is seductive to think “it gets better”, but there remain significant

obstacles to statewide policy protections in states like Ohio that have very few LGBT-friendly laws. Under the Kasich administration, some protections for LGBT people have been revoked (Johnson, 2011), and there is little indication that opponents to LGBT rights in the state legislature will cede any ground. It might not get better for many years. The reticence of gay and lesbian teachers to publicly acknowledge their non-heterosexuality, even in the most benign terms, contributes to an atmosphere where antagonistic students can create a hostile working environment for teachers. But most importantly, this atmosphere sends a strong signal to LGBT students that school is a place where teachers who are like them may feel they have to choose between keeping quiet and keeping their jobs.

References

Biegel, S. (2008). *The right to be out: sexual orientation and gender identity in America's public schools*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Blount, J. (2005). *Fit to teach: Same-sex desire, gender and school work in the twentieth century*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eckes, S. E., & McCarthy, M. M. (2008). LGBT Teachers: The evolving legal protections. *American Educational Research Journal* 45(3), 530-554.

Equality Ohio. (2012a). How Ohio Compares to other states in equality laws. Retrieved from http://www.equalityohio.org/images/PDFs/state_com_pare.pdf

Equality Ohio. (2012b). Ohio Cities and LGBT Laws. Retrieved from http://www.equalityohio.org/images/PDFs/ohio_municipalities_chart.pdf

eQualityGiving.org. (2012). States of equality scorecard. Retrieved from <http://www.equalitygiving.org/States-of-Equality-and-Gay-Rights-Scorecard>

Fejes, F. (2008). *Gay rights and moral panic: The origins of America's debate on homosexuality*. New York: Macmillan.

Fremont City Schools. (2011). *Fremont City Schools Board Policy Manual*. Retrieved from <http://www.neola.com/fremont-oh/>

Guardian US interactive team. (2012, May 8). Gay Rights in the US by State. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/interactive/2012/may/08/gay-rights-united-states>

Graves, K. (2009). *And they were wonderful teachers: Florida's purge of gay and lesbian teachers*. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Jackson, J. M. (2007). *Unmasking identities: An exploration of the lives of gay and lesbian teachers*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Johnson, A. (2011, January 22). Kasich alters order on work rights. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2011/01/22/kasich-alters-order-on-work-rights.html>

Johnson, D. K. (2004). *The lavender scare: The Cold War persecution of gays and lesbians in the federal government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lawrence v. Texas (02-102) 539 U.S. 558 (2003). Retrieved from <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-102.ZD.html>

Lubinger, B. (2004, July 25). The Farm Belt. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Retrieved from <http://www.cleveland.com/fiveohios/plaindealer/index.ssf?/fiveohios/more/109076010941440.html>

National Education Association. (2012). Statement of the NEA on Employment Non-Discrimination Act. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/home/52198.htm>

Ohio Department of Education. (2007). Typology of Ohio school districts. Retrieved from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?Page=3&TopicRelationID=390&Content=130723>

Olsen, M. (1987). A study of gay and lesbian teachers. *Journal of Homosexuality* 13(4), 73-81.

Rafferty, M. (1977). Should gays teach school? *Phi Delta Kappan* 59(2), 91-92.

Rienzo, B. A., Button, J. W., Sheu, J-J, & Li, Y. (2006). The politics of sexual orientation issues in American schools. *Journal of School Health* 76(3), 93-97.

Troy, T. (2012, October 15). Visits and spending show Ohio's status. *Toledo Blade*. Retrieved from <http://www.toledoblade.com/Politics/2012/10/15/Visits-and-spending-show-Ohio-s-status.html>

Wald, K. D., Button, J. W., & Rienzo, B. A. (1996). The politics of gay rights in American communities: Explaining antidiscrimination ordinances and policies. *American Journal of Political Science* 40(4), 1152-1178.

Wald, K. D., Rienzo, B. A., & Button, J. W. (2002). Sexual orientation and education politics: Gay and lesbian representation in American schools. *Journal of Homosexuality* 42(4), 145-168.

Yoshino, K. (2009). *Covering: The hidden assault on our civil rights*. New York: Random House.

PEA EXECUTIVE BOARD

Bonnie Fusarelli	President
Rebecca Jacobsen	Secretary
Catherine DiMartino	Treasurer
Jeffrey Henig	At-Large Member
Tina Trujillo	At-Large Member

TREASURER REPORT

CATHERINE DIMARTINO
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

The financial statement for our AERA account is listed below. As we move forward, we anticipate the following sources of revenue and expenditures until the end of the 2012 fiscal year.

- A. A substantial influx of funds from membership income paid at the beginning of the membership cycle (i.e., December 2012/ January 2013)
- B. Payment for the publication and shipping of the PEA Yearbooks published in *The Journal of Education Policy*
- C. UCEA Breakfast meeting, November 2012

AERA SIG Politics of Education Association Financial Statement (1/1/2012-8/31/2012)

Description	Beginning Balance	Income	Expenditures	Ending Balance
Beginning Balance	\$12,267.86			
Membership Dues Income		\$3,580.00		
Award Plaques			(\$189.34)	
PEA Yearbook			(\$1,634.00)	
PEA Dissertation Award 2012			(\$250.00)	
William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop at AERA 2012			(\$2,443.68)	
SIG Business Meeting at AERA			(\$811.44)	
AERA SIG Management Fee (07/12-06/13)			(\$300.00)	
	\$12,267.86	\$3,580.00	(\$5,628.46)	\$10,219.40

Membership. The total number of members as of October 1, 2012 was 211. Currently 53 (25%) of members are students and 16 (9%) are international.

Become a member of the Politics of Education Association

Membership Benefits

In addition to its presence on the AERA program, PEA membership provides members with an electronic *PEA Bulletin* (the Association's newsletter), recent publications, and information about upcoming conferences, books, articles, and events related to the politics of education. Members also receive the special double issue of *Educational Policy* (January/March) which serves as the annual yearbook of the Politics of Education Association and a biennial special issue of the *Peabody Journal of Education*. The association also maintains its own web site <http://politicsofeducationassociation.wikispaces.com/>; offers course materials for teaching courses related to the Politics of Education, POETS (Politics of Education Teachers Services); sponsors timely presentations from senior scholars and political insiders; and provides mentoring for new faculty and graduate students.

Join PEA

Since the Politics of Education Association is a special interest group (SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), you can join PEA when applying for a new AERA membership or renewing your AERA membership.

If it is not time to renew your AERA membership, then you can still join or renew your PEA membership online by:

- >Go to AERA homepage <http://www.aera.net>
- >Login
- >On the left toolbar select ***Member Homepage***
- >Under Profile and Member Benefits, select ***SIG Memberships***
- >Above SIG Memberships, select ***Purchase Additional SIG Memberships***
- >**\$40 (faculty)**
- >**\$20 (student)**

Please note that all SIG memberships will *expire* at the same time the AERA membership expire—generally, at the end of the year.

The Politics of Education Association (PEA) was formed in 1969 as the Politics of Education Society. In 1978, it became the Politics of Education Association, as part of AERA. Interest in educational policy and politics expanded so that in 1987, the Association successfully called for the formation of a new division within the American Educational Research Association. Today, that division is known as Division L: Policy and Politics. The Politics of Education Association continues as a Special Interest Group affiliated with the American Educational Research Association

Past Presidents of PEA

Catherine Lugg (2010-2012) Rutgers University
Lora Cohen-Vogel (2008-2010) Florida State University (currently at University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
Bruce Cooper (2004-2008) Fordham University
Kenneth Wong (2002-2004) Vanderbilt University (currently at Brown University)
Hanne Mawhinney (2000-2002) University of Maryland, College Park
William Firestone (1998-2000) Rutgers University
Jane Clark Lindle: (1996-1998) University of Kentucky (currently at Clemson University)
Robert Wimpelberg (1994-1996) University of New Orleans (now University of Houston)
Betty Malen (1992-1994) University of Washington (now University of Maryland, College Park)
Catherine Marshall (1990-1992) Vanderbilt University (currently at University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
William Lowe Boyd (1988-1990) Pennsylvania State University
Michael Kirst (1986-1988) Stanford University
Jay D. Scribner (1984-1986) Temple University (now University of Texas-Austin)
Douglas Mitchell (1982-1984) University of California, Riverside
James G. Cibulka (1980-1982) University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (currently at NCATE)

Past Chairs of PEA

Donald H. Layton (1978-1980) SUNY-Albany
David K. Wiles (1976-1978) Miami University (later SUNY at Albany)
David K. Wiles (1975-1976) Miami University (later SUNY at Albany) (completed LaNoue's 1st term)
George LaNoue (1974-1975 -- stepped down after one year) Teachers College (currently at University of Maryland, Baltimore County)
Michael W. Kirst (1972-1974) Stanford University
Mike M. Milstein (1970-1972) SUNY-Buffalo (later University of New Mexico)
David L. Colton (First President; 1969-1970) Washington University; (retired from University of New Mexico)

Politics of Education Association Bulletin is an official publication of the Politics of Education Association (PEA) and is published two times per year. We encourage authors to submit essays on topics of interest in education policy and politics to the co-editors:

Kyle Ingle, Co-Editor

Bowling Green State University
519 Education Building
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
wingle@bgsu.edu
Phone: (419) 372-7313
Fax: (419) 372-8448

Ann Allen, Co-Editor

Ohio State University
301 Ramseyer Hall
Columbus, Ohio 43210
allen.952@osu.edu
Phone: (614) 292-0289
Fax: (614) 292-7070

**The Association for Education Finance and Policy
38th Annual Conference**

*New Orleans, Louisiana
March 14-16, 2013*

**Proposal Submission Deadline:
November 16, 2012**